JS 44 (Rev. 10/20) Case 2:22-cv-12317-MFL-JJCFVIECFOVETR REQUEST Filed 09/29/20/vhi@agion 1rof: 05/cland

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purp	oose of initiating the civil d	ocket s	heet. (SEE INSTRUC	CTIONS ON NEXT PAGE (OF THIS F	ORM.)						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DDK Acquisitions LLC a Michigan limited liability on					DEFENDAN							
DDK Acquisitions, LLC, a Michigan limited liability co.				The Hanover Insurance Company, a foreign corp., and								
				Brown & Brown, Inc., a foreign corp.								
(b) County of Residence of		Listed Plaintiff <u>(</u> IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	Dakland ASES)		County of Reside			ed Defendant LAINTIFF CASES	Worcester, Mas	sachuset	ts
	(12)	ICLI I	11 0.5. 1 2 11 11 11 1	1525)		NOTE: IN LANI			ON CASES, USE T VOLVED.		OF	
	2) 144							LAND II	NVOLVED.			
Jasoi	c) Attorneys (Firm Name, 1) J. Liss (P48742); Fabian,	<i>Address</i> Sklar,	, and Telephone Numbe King & Liss, P.C.	er)		Attorneys (If Kno	wn)					
	0 W. Twelve Mile Rd., Far 553-2000	rmingto	on Hills, MI 48331									
					1							
II.	BASIS OF JURISD	ICTI	ON (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF (For Diversity Cases Of		NCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in and One Box for I		
<u> </u>	U.S. Government	3	Federal Question				PTF	DEF			PTF	DEF
	Plaintiff		(U.S. Government	Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State	1	<u> </u>	Incorporated or P of Business In		□ 4	4
n 2	U.S. Government	1 4	Diversity		Citiz	en of Another State	1 2	□ 2	Incorporated and	Principal Place	 5	5
ப -	Defendant	4	•	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Anomer State			of Business In			
					Citiz	en or Subject of a	 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
137	NATURE OF CHIL	r			Fo	oreign Country	- C1		C 27	g : g 1 B		
11.	NATURE OF SUIT	(Place		nly) ORTS	FO	ORFEITURE/PENALT			for: Nature of KRUPTCY		STATUT	
1	10 Insurance	PE	RSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		25 Drug Related Seizure			peal 28 USC 158	375 False C		
	20 Marine 30 Miller Act		Airplane Airplane Product	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability		of Property 21 USC 8 90 Other	881	423 Wit	hdrawal USC 157	376 Qui Ta 3729(a		С
□ 1 ⁴	40 Negotiable Instrument		Liability	367 Health Care/		70 Other	L			400 State R	eapportio	nment
1:	50 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment		Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury			┢	820 Cor	RTY RIGHTS ovrights	410 Antitru 430 Banks		ng
	51 Medicare Act 52 Recovery of Defaulted	_	Federal Employers'	Product Liability	.			830 Pate	ent	450 Comm	erce	J
□ 1.	Student Loans	_	Liability Marine	368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product	1			Nev	ent - Abbreviated v Drug Application		eer Influe	
	(Excludes Veterans) 53 Recovery of Overpayment	345	Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	_{TV} —	LABOR		840 Tra	demark end Trade Secrets	Corrup	t Organiza ner Credit	
_	of Veteran's Benefits		Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud		10 Fair Labor Standards	\neg		of 2016	(15 US	SC 1681 o	r 1692)
_	60 Stockholders' Suits 90 Other Contract	355	Motor Vehicle Product Liability	371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal		Act 20 Labor/Management		SOCIA	L SECURITY	485 Teleph	one Const tion Act	ımer
	95 Contract Product Liability	360	Other Personal	Property Damage		Relations		861 HI	A (1395ff)	490 Cable/S	Sat TV	
∐ 15	96 Franchise	362	Injury Personal Injury -	385 Property Damage Product Liability		10 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical	E		ck Lung (923) VC/DIWW (405(g))	850 Securit Exchai		iodities/
	REAL PROPERTY		Medical Malpractice	PRISONER PETITION	70	Leave Act O Other Labor Litigation		1	D Title XVI (405(g))	890 Other S	-	
2	10 Land Condemnation	_	Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:		1 Employee Retirement		1 005 KS	(403(g))	893 Enviro	nmental M	latters
	20 Foreclosure 30 Rent Lease & Ejectment	=	Voting Employment	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate		Income Security Act	-		es (U.S. Plaintiff	895 Freedo	m of Info	mation
□ 24	40 Torts to Land		Housing/	Sentence				or l	Defendant)	896 Arbitra		
	45 Tort Product Liability 90 All Other Real Property	☐ 445	Accommodations Amer. w/Disabilities -	530 General 535 Death Penalty		IMMIGRATION	└-		—Third Party USC 7609	899 Admin	istrative P view or A	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Employment	Other:		62 Naturalization Applica	ation			Agency	Decision	
		H 440	Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights	er 📙 40	55 Other Immigration Actions				950 Constit		01
		448	3 Education	555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee -								
				Conditions of								
V.	ORIGIN (Place an "X" i	n One B	ox Only)	Confinement								
	Original 2 Ren	moved	from 3		1 4 Rein				6 Multidist	rict 🔲 8	Multidis	
	Proceeding Sta	te Cou	rt	Appellate Court	Reoj		other D <i>ecify)</i>	ıstrıct	Litigation Transfer	1 -	Litigation Direct I	
				atute under which you ar	re filing (s unless d	iversity):			
VI.	CAUSE OF ACTIO		8 U.S.C. §1332 rief description of ca	nice.								
			Claim for insurance p									
VII	I. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$ 75,000.0	0		HECK YES only URY DEMAND		compla No	
VII	II. RELATED CASI	E(S)								<u> </u>		
	IF ANY	(~)	(See instructions):	JUDGE				_DOCK	ET NUMBER _			
DAT Sept	E tember 29, 2022			signature of at /s/Jason J. Liss (P								
FOR	OFFICE USE ONLY											
R	ECEIPT# AM	MOUNT		APPLYING IFP		JUDG	Е		MAG. JU	JDGE		

Case 2:22-cv-12317-MFL-JJCG ECF No. 1, PageID.2 Filed 09/29/22 Page 2 of 15 PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11

1 011007	THE TO LOOKE ROLL OO. IT	
1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?	Yes
If yes, give	e the following information:	■ No
Court:		
Case No.:		
Judge:		
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.)	Yes No
If yes, give	e the following information:	
Court:		
Case No.:		
Judge:		
Notes :		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the Eastern District of Michigan

DDK Acquisitions, LLC, a Midlimited liability co.,	chigan Plaintiff,)))	Civil Action No. 22-cv-
v. THE HANOVER INSURANCE a foreign corporation, and BROWN & BROWN, INC.,	COMPANY,)	Hon.
a foreign corporation,	Defendants. SUMMONS I) N A CIVI	IL ACTION

Worcester, MA 01653

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

The Hanover Insurance Company

400 Lincoln St.

To:

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Serve RA: The Corporation Company

40600 Ann Arbor Rd. E., Ste. 201

Plymouth, MI 48170-4675

Jason J. Liss (P48742) Fabian, Sklar, King & Liss, P.C. 33450 W. Twelve Mile Rd. Farmington Hills, MI 48331 (248) 553-2000

If you fail to respond, judgment by default may be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

DAVID J. WEAVER, CLERK OF COURT



By:	
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Date of Issuance:

DDK Acquisitions, LLC, a Michigan

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the Eastern District of Michigan

	limited liability co.,	Plaintiff,)))	Civil Action No. 22-cv-
	THE HANOVER INSURANCE COL a foreign corporation, and BROWN & BROWN, INC.,	MPANY,)))	Hon.
	a foreign corporation,	Defendants.)	
		SUMMONS	IN A CI	VIL ACTION
То:	Brown & Brown, Inc. 300 North Beach St. Daytona Beach, FL 32114		2900 Wes	: CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service st Road, Ste. 500 sing, MI 48823
	A lawsuit has been filed against y	ou.		
(a)(2 Rule	United States or a United States agence 2) or (3) — you must serve on the plair	y, or an office tiff an answe	er or empl r to the att	counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are loyee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 ached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and
	Jason J. Liss (P48742) Fabian, Sklar, King & 33450 W. Twelve Mil (248) 553-2000	Liss, P.C.	gton Hills	, MI 48331
also	If you fail to respond, judgment by must file your answer or motion with	•	oe entered	against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Date of Issuance:



DAVID J. WEAVER, CLERK OF COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

DDK ACQUISITIONS, LLC, a Michigan limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 22-cv-Hon.

VS.

THE HANOVER INSURANCE COMPANY, a foreign corporation, and BROWN & BROWN, INC., a foreign corporation,

Defendants.	

COMPLAINT

NOW COMES Plaintiff, DDK ACQUISITIONS, LLC, by and through its attorneys, FABIAN, SKLAR, KING & LISS, P.C., and for its Complaint against Defendants, THE HANOVER INSURANCE COMPANY and BROWN & BROWN, INC., state unto this Honorable Court as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff, DDK ACQUISITIONS, LLC, is a Michigan limited liability company, which is licensed to conduct business in the State of Michigan, whose members include:
- A. Steve Friedman, who resides in Southfield, MI and is a citizen of the State of Michigan;

- B. Avi Smith, who resides in Southfield, MI and is a citizen of the State of Michigan;
- C. Phil Friedman, who resides in Southfield, MI and is a citizen of the State of Michigan;
- D. Max Berlin, who resides in Southfield, MI and is a citizen of the State of Michigan;
- E. Yehuda Kleiner, who resides in Southfield, MI and is a citizen of the State of Michigan;
 - F. DK Detroit Properties, LLC, whose members include:
 - (1) Yehuda Kleiner, who resides in Southfield, MI and is a citizen of the State of Michigan; and
 - (2) Dovid Kleiner, resides in Brooklyn, NY and is a citizen of the State of New York.
- 2. Defendant, THE HANOVER INSURANCE COMPANY ("HANOVER"), upon information and belief, is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Hampshire, which has its principal place of business in Worcester, Massachusetts and is a citizen of the State of New Hampshire and the State of Massachusetts.
- 3. Defendant, BROWN & BROWN, INC. ("BROWN & BROWN"), upon information and belief, is a corporation organized and existing under the laws

of the State of Florida, which has its principal place of business in Daytona Beach, FL and is a citizen of the State of Florida.

- 4. The facts giving rise to this action occurred in the Eastern District of Michigan.
- 5. The amount in controversy between the parties exceeds the sum of Seventy-Five Thousand (\$75,000.00) Dollars exclusive of costs and interest.
- 6. The Court has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 due to the amount in controversy and the parties' diversity of citizenship.
- 7. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was the named insured or otherwise entitled to insurance benefits pursuant to policy no. IHH H461453 00 ("the POLICY"), procured by Defendant BROWN and issued by Defendant HANOVER, a copy of which is in Defendants' possession, which insured Plaintiff's commercial building located at 23800 Northwestern Hwy., Southfield, MI 48075 ("the BUILDING") against all risks of direct physical loss unless expressly limited or excluded by the POLICY.
- 8. On or about November 30, 2021, while the POLICY was in effect, Plaintiff's insured building was damaged by direct physical loss resulting from water.
 - 9. Upon discovery, Plaintiff timely notified Defendants of the loss.

- 10. Pursuant to the terms of the POLICY, Plaintiff sent satisfactory proof of the fact and the amount of its loss to Defendant HANOVER.
- 11. On June 30, 2022, Defendant HANOVER purported to unilaterally rescind the POLICY based on its allegation that Plaintiff made a material misrepresentation in the unsigned application for insurance, specifically the representation that the insured structure had not incurred a loss or damage over \$10,000 in the three years preceding the application for insurance when, in fact, the BUILDING had suffered a substantial loss on June 5, 2020. Defendant HANOVER further alleged that had it been aware of the June 5, 2020 loss, it would not have issued the POLICY. (Ex. 1).
- 12. Defendant BROWN & BROWN is an independent insurance agency, licensed by the State of Michigan, which procured the POLICY on Plaintiff's behalf from Defendant HANOVER.
- 13. In procuring the POLICY, Defendant BROWN & BROWN completed and submitted an unsigned electronic application for insurance to Defendant HANOVER on or about December 17, 2020. (Ex. 2).
- 14. At the time Defendant BROWN & BROWN completed and submitted the application for insurance, it had actual knowledge of the substantial loss that occurred at the BUILDING on or about June 5, 2020. (Ex. 3).
 - 15. Despite its actual knowledge to the contrary, Defendant BROWN &

BROWN represented "No" in the application for insurance in response to the question, "Has the builder/remodeler and/or structure itself had any single loss or damage over \$10,000 in the last 3 years (Include insured/uninsured losses/damages)" (see Ex. 2, p. 1).

16. Defendant BROWN & BROWN never presented the application to Plaintiff to review and approve prior to it being submitted to Defendant HANOVER.

COUNT I – BREACH OF CONTRACT

- 17. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegation contained in paragraphs one (1) through sixteen (16) above as if set forth fully herein.
- 18. Upon information and belief, any misrepresentation in the application for insurance was not material.
- 19. Defendant HANOVER's unilateral attempt to rescind the POLICY based on a non-material misrepresentation in the application for insurance constitutes a breach of the parties' insurance contract.
- 20. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant HANOVER's breach of the parties' insurance contract, Defendant HANOVER remains indebted to Plaintiff for its insured losses, and any incidental and consequential damages that were in the contemplation of the parties at the time the contract was made, or which are the natural and usual consequences of a breach of a property insurance contract.

21. Mich. Comp. Laws § 500.2833(1)(m) provides that each fire insurance policy issued or delivered in the State of Michigan shall contain the following provision:

Each fire insurance policy issued or delivered in this state shall contain the following provisions:

* * *

That if the insured and insurer fail to agree on the actual cash value or amount of the loss, either party may make a written demand that the amount of the loss or the actual cash value be set by appraisal. If either makes a written demand for appraisal, each party shall select a competent, independent appraiser and notify the other of the appraiser's identity within 20 days after receipt of the written demand. The 2 appraisers shall then select a competent, impartial umpire. If the 2 appraisers are unable to agree upon an umpire within 15 days, the insured or insurer may ask a judge of the circuit court for the county in which the loss occurred or in which the property is located to select an umpire. The appraisers shall then set the amount of the loss and actual cash value as to each item. If the appraisers submit a written report of an agreement to the insurer, the amount agreed upon shall be the amount of the loss. If the appraisers fail to agree within a reasonable time, they shall submit their differences to the umpire. Written agreement signed by any 2 of these 3 shall set the amount of the loss. Each appraiser shall be paid by the party selecting that appraiser. Other expenses of the appraisal and the compensation of the umpire shall be paid equally by the insured and the insurer.

- 22. Pursuant to Mich. Comp. Laws § 500.2833(1)(m) and the terms of the parties' insurance contract, Plaintiff demands that the amount of the loss and its actual cash value be set by appraisal.
- 23. Plaintiff is entitled to Judgment for the amount of loss as determined by the appraisal panel, plus all incidental and consequential damages incurred by

Plaintiff that were in the contemplation of the parties at the time the contract was made, or which are the natural and usual consequence of a breach of a property insurance contract.

- 24. Mich. Comp. Laws § 500.2006 provides for the addition of 12 percent interest on claim payments that the Defendant insurer failed to make within 60 days of receiving satisfactory proof of loss.
- 25. Pursuant to Mich. Comp. Laws § 500.2006, Plaintiff is entitled to 12 percent interest on all amounts paid or owing under the subject policy of insurance which Defendant HANOVER failed to timely pay.

WHEREFORE Plaintiff, DDK ACQUISITIONS, LLC, respectfully request this Honorable Court to enter a judgment in its favor and against Defendant, THE HANOVER INSURANCE COMPANY, as follows:

- A. That a judgment of liability under the policy of insurance be entered for Plaintiff, DDK ACQUISITIONS, LLC, and against Defendant, THE HANOVER INSURANCE COMPANY;
- B. That any dispute concerning the amount of loss be submitted to appraisal pursuant to Mich. Comp. Laws § 500.2833(1)(m) and the terms of the POLICY;
- C. That a money judgment be entered for Plaintiff, DDK ACQUISITIONS, LLC, and against Defendant, THE HANOVER INSURANCE

COMPANY, in the amount owing on the appraisal award;

- D. That the judgment award all incidental and consequential damages incurred by Plaintiff that were in the contemplation of the parties at the time the contract was made, or which are the natural and usual consequence of a breach of a property insurance contract;
- E. That Plaintiff be awarded penalty interest pursuant to Mich. Comp. Laws § 500.2006;
- F. That Plaintiff be awarded statutory interest, taxable costs, and attorney fees to which it may additionally be entitled; and
- G. That the judgment award such other relief as the Court deems just in equity and good conscience.

COUNT II - NEGLIGENCE

- 26. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegation contained in paragraphs one (1) through twenty-five (25) above as if set forth fully herein.
- 27. Defendant BROWN & BROWN undertook the duty to procure an insurance policy on Plaintiff's behalf that would fully insure the BUILDING against covered risks of direct physical loss.
- 28. Having undertaken the duty to procure a policy for Plaintiff, Defendant BROWN & BROWN, acting through its employees and/or agents, was required to exercise such reasonable skill and ordinary diligence as may fairly be expected from

a person in its profession or situation to do that which was necessary to properly obtain a policy and seeing that it effectually covered the property to be insured.

- 29. As an independent insurance agent, Defendant BROWN & BROWN, INC. owed a fiduciary duty to Plaintiff, its principal, to act in Plaintiff's best interest, both in terms of finding an insurer that could provide Plaintiff with the most comprehensive coverage and in ensuring that the insurance contract properly addressed Plaintiff's needs.
- 30. Defendant BROWN & BROWN owed Plaintiff a duty to accurately complete the insurance application it submitted to Defendant HANOVER and to not misrepresent in the application, despite its actual knowledge to the contrary, that the structure had not had any single loss or damage over \$10,000 in the three years preceding the application for insurance.
- 31. Defendant BROWN & BROWN breached one or more of the aforementioned duties and was negligent.
- 32. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant BROWN & BROWN's negligence, Plaintiff suffered uninsured losses to the BUILDING.
- 33. Defendant BROWN & BROWN is vicariously liable under respondent superior for the negligent acts and/or omissions of its employees/agents who completed and submitted the subject application for insurance to Defendant HANOVER on Plaintiff's behalf, since those acts and/or omissions occurred in the

course and scope of the actual or apparent authority Defendant BROWN & BROWN gave to its employees and/or agents.

WHEREFORE Plaintiff, DDK ACQUISITIONS, LLC, respectfully request this Honorable Court to enter a judgment in its favor and against Defendant, BROWN & BROWN, INC., in an amount to which Plaintiff is found entitled, including any and all interest, costs and attorney fees recoverable under the law.

Respectfully submitted,

FABIAN, SKLAR, KING & LISS, P.C.

/s/ Jason J. Liss

Jason J. Liss (P48742) Attorneys for Plaintiff 33450 W. Twelve Mile Road Farmington Hills, MI 48331 (248) 553-2000 jliss@fabiansklar.com

Dated: September 29, 2022

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

DDK ACQUISITIONS, LLC, a Michigan limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 22-cv-Hon.

VS.

THE HANOVER INSURANCE COMPANY, a foreign corporation, and BROWN & BROWN, INC., a foreign corporation,

Defendants.	

JURY DEMAND

NOW COMES Plaintiff, DDK ACQUISITIONS, LLC, by and through its attorneys, FABIAN, SKLAR, KING & LISS, P.C., and demands a jury trial in the above-entitled cause of action.

Respectfully submitted,

FABIAN, SKLAR, KING & LISS, P.C.

/s/ Jason J. Liss

Jason J. Liss (P48742)
Attorneys for Plaintiff
33450 W. Twelve Mile Road
Farmington Hills, MI 48331
(248) 553-2000
jliss@fabiansklar.com

Dated: September 29, 2022